Case 1:14-cv-02444-SHS Document 52 Filed 03/30/15 Page 1 of 2

NEW YORK
LONDON
SINGAPORE
PHILADELPHIA
CHICAGO
WASHINGTON, DC
SAN FRANCISCO
SILICON VALLEY
SAN DIEGO
SHANGHAI
BOSTON
HOUSTON
LOS ANGELES
HANOI
HO CHI MINH CITY

<u>Duane</u>Morris[®]

FIRM and AFFILIATE OFFICES

EVE I. KLEIN DIRECT DIAL: +1 212 692 1065 PERSONAL FAX: +1 212 202 7559 E-MAIL: eiklein@duanemorris.com

www.duanemorris.com

ATLANTA
BALTIMORE
WILMINGTON
MIAMI
BOCA RATON
PITTSBURGH
NEWARK
LAS VEGAS
CHERRY HILL
LAKE TAHOE
MYANMAR
OMAN
A GCC REPRESENTATIVE OFFICE
OF DUANE MORRIS

MEXICO CITY
ALLIANCE WITH
MIRANDA & ESTAVILLO
SRI LANKA
ALLIANCE WITH
GOWERS INTERNATIONAL

March 30, 2015

VIA ECF

The Honorable Sidney H. Stein United States District Court Southern District of New York 500 Pearl St. New York, NY 10007-1312

Re: Dedra De La Rosa v. BTM Development Partners, LLC and Related Management Co., L.P., Docket No. 14-cv-2444(SHS)(RLE)

Dear Judge Stein:

Defendants BTM Development Partners, LLC and Related Management Co., L.P. (collectively "Defendants") respectfully request the Court to order Plaintiff Dedra De La Rosa ("Plaintiff") to respond to Defendants' Expert Report/Settlement Proposal dated March 13, 2015. On March 6, 2015, the parties provided the Court with a joint status report where the parties agreed that Defendants would provide Plaintiff with a revised Expert Report/Settlement Proposal by March 13, 2015 and Plaintiff would respond by March 27, 2015. Despite representing to the Court that Plaintiff would provide a response and despite Defendants' follow-up emails to Plaintiff on March 24, 2015 and March 27, 2015, Plaintiff has ignored Defendants' emails and failed to provide her response or any explanation for her delay as of this date.

Unfortunately, without Court intervention, Plaintiff has continually ignored Defendants' good faith efforts to resolve this litigation or, at minimum, narrow the issues for discovery or trial. As noted in Defendants' December 29, 2014 correspondence to the Court, Plaintiff ignored Defendants' ten (10) requests for a telephone conference to discuss Defendants' initial Expert Report. Following the status conference held on January 13, 2015 and the subsequent Order dated January 14, 2015, Plaintiff finally provided a response to Defendant's Expert Report. Through the Court-required inperson conferences and joint re-inspection of Defendants' property, 41 items of the 62 items identified in Plaintiff's Expert Report have been resolved. The remaining items fall into six limited areas of disagreement.

Duane Morris

The Honorable Sidney H. Stein March 30, 2015 Page 2

As stated in Defendants' December 29, 2015 correspondence, Defendants believe that Plaintiff's continued failure and refusal to engage with Defendants without Court intervention is an effort to drive up attorneys' fees and costs. Plaintiff's failure to provide a response to Defendants' revised Expert Report/Settlement Proposal further indicates that Plaintiff intends to unnecessarily prolong this litigation to increase attorneys' fees and/or Plaintiff is failing to prioritize this case which was filed nearly a year ago. As a result of Plaintiff's inaction, Defendants have expended additional legal fees in its efforts to engage Plaintiff. Thus in addition to Defendants' request for an order directing Plaintiff to provide her response, Defendants additionally request a status conference at the Court's earliest convenience. At the proposed status conference, the parties would provide their latest proposals in camera to the Court so the Court can assist the parties resolve the remaining limited issues in dispute.

We thank the Court for its consideration.

Respectfully,

/s/ Eve I. Klein

Eve I. Klein

EIK/jb

cc: Glen H. Parker, Esq. (via ECF)